

REMARKS:

In response to the restriction requirement, Applicant elects the invention identified by the Examiner as "Invention I" and Applicant cancels claims 6-20 without prejudice (with the intention of pursuing the cancelled claims in one or more divisional applications).

In response to the objection to the drawings, Applicant notes that the drawings as filed show the features of the amended claims:

printed circuit board 12 (shown in Figs. 3 and 4) implements an embodiment of the control circuitry of claim 1;

a first one of rubberized keys 1 (of Fig. 3) and the corresponding set of terminals 13 on board 12 (of Fig. 3) implement an embodiment of the first switch of claim 1;

another set of terminals 13 (of Fig. 3) and the corresponding one of rubberized keys 1 (of Fig. 3) implement an embodiment of the second switch of claim 1;

switching circuit 24 of Fig. 4 (having output terminal 24A) is an embodiment of the switching circuitry mentioned in claim 1, and any two of input devices 17 of Fig. 5 (which can be coupled to terminals 24B of switching circuit 24 of Fig. 4) are embodiments of the first input device and second input device mentioned in claim 1;

frame 2 (of Fig. 3) is an embodiment of the frame of claim 1;

element 9 of Fig. 3 is an embodiment of the retaining element of claim 3; and

switching circuitry 24 (of Fig. 4) is an embodiment of the first switching circuitry of claim 5.

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,204,768 (Tsakiris) in view of U.S. Patent 5,610,797 (Nakamura). In support of the rejection, the Examiner asserts that in the system of Tsakiris:

"the digital computer 101 is capable of functioning in a similar way as described in application claim 1 herein, with terminals 114, 109 etc. [sic], and control circuitry as in remote control 123, transceiver 121 [sic] to assert first input device [sic] and response pad transceiver 127 to assert second input

f

device [sic]."

In response, Applicant respectfully observes that the Office Action does not articulate which elements of Tsakiris' system are considered to correspond to the control circuitry of claim 1, the "first terminals" (which contact one rubberized key) of claim 1, the "second terminals" (which contact another rubberized key) of claim 1, the frame (configured to mount rubberized keys) of claim 1, and the switching circuitry of claim 5 (which is an element distinct from the control circuitry of claim 1), and which signals generated by Tsakiris' system are considered to correspond to the "first input device selection signal" and the "second input device selection signal" recited in claim 1. Applicant contends that the claims as amended are patentable over the cited references for the following reasons, and requests that the Examiner articulate which elements of Tsakiris' system are considered to correspond to the noted elements of claims 1 and 5 (and which signals generated by Tsakiris' system are considered to correspond to the noted signals recited in claim 1), if the rejection of claim 1 based on Tsakiris is not withdrawn.

The control circuitry of the apparatus of amended claim 1 generates a "first input device selection signal" in response to closing of a first switch. The first switch is a rubberized key which selectively contacts a first set of terminals of such control circuitry. The apparatus of amended claim 1 also generates a "second input device selection signal" in response to closing of a second switch. In the apparatus of claim 2, the second switch is another rubberized key which selectively contacts a second set of terminals of the control circuitry. As recited in amended claim 1, each "input device selection" signal is a signal which causes switching circuitry (e.g., switching circuit 24 of Fig. 4) to connect an "input device" (e.g., one of input devices 17 of Fig. 5, coupled through patch points such as patch points 7 of Fig. 1 to switching circuit 24) to an output terminal of the switching circuitry (e.g., terminal 24A of circuit 24, which is intended to be coupled to an audio-visual projector such as projector 14 of Fig. 5). Applicant is unable to identify any teaching of such an input device selection signal in Tsakiris.

Applicant is also unable to identify any teaching of such an input

device selection signal in Nakamura. The Examiner has not identified any element of Nakamura as being "control circuitry" of the type claimed which generates a "first input device selection signal" in response to closing of a first switch and a "second input device selection signal" in response to closing of a second switch as claimed.

Applicant further contends that substitution of rubberized keys for any of the controls of Tsakiris' system would not result in a modified version of Tsakiris' system which generates a "first input device selection signal" in response to closing of a first switch and a "second input device selection signal" in response to closing of a second switch as claimed.

Applicant is also unable to identify any teaching determinable from either Nakamura or Tsakiris suggesting modification of the teaching of either of these references to reach the claimed invention.. Absent such teaching determinable from art of record, Applicant respectfully contends that it is improper to reject the claims on the basis of an unsupported assertion that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teaching of Nakamura and Tsakiris (considered individually or in combination) to reach the claimed invention.

Respectfully submitted,  
LIMBACH & LIMBACH L.L.P.

Attorneys for Applicants

By: Alfred A. Equitz  
Alfred A. Equitz  
Reg. No. 30,922

December 22, 1999

Our File: SPCO-100